DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 447 HE 033 045

AUTHOR Wolverton, Mimi; Gonzales, Mary Jo
TITLE Career Paths of Academic Deans.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Deans; Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Role; *College Administration; *Deans; Higher Education; *Leadership Qualities; Nurses; *Nursing Education; Private Colleges; School Administration; State Universities; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Washington State University

ABSTRACT

This paper examines various career paths leading to deanship and considers the implications of the findings for women and minorities who aspire to this position. The paper is part of a larger study of academic deanship conducted by the Center for Academic Leadership at Washington State University between October 1996 and January 1997. Data for the study were gathered by a questionnaire sent to 1,370 deans (response rate 60 percent) at 360 public and private institutions; 41 percent of the respondents were women. Sections of this report examine the general profile of female, male, and minority-status deans; of deans by institution type and by discipline; and significant differences between male and female deans, between minority and non-minority deans, and of deans by institution type and discipline. Findings indicate that women and minorities remain underrepresented in deanships; noting that female representation in this study is skewed because half of the respondents were deans of nursing colleges. It was also found that deans do not follow a set career trajectory, and that most groups of deans did not see their position as a natural stepping stone to the provost position (more than 25 percent planned to return to faculty positions). Eight data tables are appended. (Contains 24 references.) (CH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 447

Career Paths of Academic Deans

By

Mimi Wolverton, Washington State University
Mary Jo Gonzales, Washington State University

Presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference
New Orleans, LA
April 24 - 28, 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 083 045

Career Paths of Academic Deans

Academic administration stands as a primary source of change and power in higher education (Mech 1997). As such, one would believe that deans follow some recognized pattern of career advancement through which they gain the experience necessary to be effective. Yet, early studies demonstrated that no particular, overarching career line or point of entry existed that lead to the deanship (Twombly, 1986; Moore, Salimbene, Marlier & Bragg,1983). This suggests that being in the right place at the right time may be the most important criterion for reaching the academic deanship. To complicate matters further, current research indicates that although increasing numbers of women and minorities are employed at colleges and universities, it appears that relatively few advance into administrative positions (Turner, Myers, and Creswell, 1997).

This lack of advancement, even for white females, may stem from the propensity for career paths, or the lack thereof, to become institutionalized over time, in part, to limit the number of eligible applicants for higher level administration positions. By determining who will advance in an organization, individuals can be eliminated from organizational advancement based on characteristics regardless of qualifications (Forbes and Piercy, 1991). In fact, Konrad & Pfeffer (1991) found that "organizations [types of universities] are segregated more by ethnicity. . . and jobs [academic disciplines] . . . by gender" (p.154). Williams (1985) affirms this suspicion when he states, "Career path models that could be used by minority [men and] women [and white women] who wish to advance in predominately white institutions are rare" (p.10). Such findings raise concerns about the efficacy of equal opportunity in terms of who can and will become academic deans.

This paper examines the career paths of deans who participated in a national study to determine whether career advancement to the deanship still remains haphazard. It then considers the implications of study findings for women and minorities who aspire to this position.

Academic Career Paths and Mobility

In academic institutions, there are several gateways an individual must pass through prior to the academic deanship. Conventional wisdom dictates that a candidate must survive the faculty, third-year review, gain tenure and promotion in rank, and assume some intermediary administrative position before ascending to the deanship. This *time-in-line* mobility option impacts how fast an individual can travel up the academic ladder. Specifically, theorists, such as Ost & Twale (1989), suggest that "formal structures of universities and colleges permit little career mobility through the hierarchical ladders of administration without traditional time-in-line experience" (p.24).

They surmise that "for those without time-in-line credentials (in particular, women ad minorities), only non-traditional administrative positions [such as Student Affairs or Financial Aid], which are defined in terms of specific competencies and/or responsibilities are reasonable options." Recent demographic information about employment in academic institutions affirms this trend (i.e.,. Turner *et al*, 1997). Carroll (1991), in studying department chairs, discovered that "women were more likely than men to become department chairs before becoming a full professor" (p.676), perhaps, eliminating one rung of the hierarchical career ladder. Two other mobility factors surfaced in the late 1980s career path literature. First, Twombly (1986) determined that the "level of earlier positions was more important than the specific position" (p.34). And, Moore and Sagaria (1981) conclusions suggested that middle academic positions

have lower inter-organizational mobility because people are typically promoted from within rather than through a lengthy national search.

Second, due to the nature of academic cultures, sponsorship and promotion are intimately tied to advancement in academic institutions. Without some form of mentoring or instruction, a career path will at best be happenstance (Warner, 1988). Moore and Sagaria (1981) contend that there are three major higher education administration tracks commonly found in most colleges and universities: Academic, Support (Student Affairs), and, Institutional (Fiscal, Advancement, Personnel). Tracks are predetermined early in a career. Those moving into the support and institutional tracks are unlikely to be eligible for academic track (due to faculty requirements and status). Thus, for individuals not in faculty positions or holding faculty status, the likelihood of advancement to the deanship is significantly less than an individual holding that status. Park (1996) concluded that in academic institutions women's roles were typically support roles, rarely the decision-makers, and typically considered outside of the academic track.

In addition, Warner (1988), in a study of academic segregation, found that women typically hold positions in nursing, home economics, liberal arts, social science, and education. This study followed Moore and Sagaria's (1981) study where women were clustered in teaching/nursing, private women's colleges and selected liberal arts colleges and Tinsley's (1985) study in which women were more likely to hold staff than line positions. In addition, Warner (1988) found that two-thirds of top-level academic administrators evolved from the physical and hard science disciplines. And that administrators in liberal arts and social science were less likely to move beyond the deanship.

Ross & Green (1990, p. 70) in their study of academic mobility by discipline concluded, "Individuals with degrees in education or counseling will have a hard time obtaining deanships

in arts and sciences; deans of education, business, and technology will be disadvantaged in their quests for academic vice-presidents or in moving to more prestigious institutions." They also found that organizational mobility in academic systems was complicated by institutional prestige, measured predominately by selectivity and institutional type.

These general conclusions are confirmed by current academic surveys, which find that women, and particularly minority women, are not pursuing the most prestigious degrees. Graves (1990) found that African American women's "degrees are more likely to be in "female" disciplines, such as education and the social sciences. . . [and that they] tend to be concentrated in the non-tenured, lower-level faculty ranks" (p.5). Their lower status position results in fewer chances of being signaled or sponsored for advancement is not exclusive to African American faculty. Astin, Antonio, Cress and Astin (1997) found that "Mexican American faculty disproportionately occupy the lower ranks, where 44% of Mexican American faculty hold non-tenure track positions;" 41% of Latinas and 37% of Native American women were either lecturers or instructors (p.12).

In research specifically related to administrators, researchers found more than one-half of the female deans in the study were in nursing, home economics, liberal arts, or continuing education. Twice as many men as women were married. Slightly more women than men had mentors. As a whole, 29% of the deans in the study had been department chairs prior to becoming dean, 16% had been associate deans, 10% came from outside the academy, 6% had been both department chairs and associate deans. More than one-third of the deans in this study had no prior administrative experience Women were more apt to be looking for other positions and were more likely to want to leave the academy. Researchers concluded that the nature of the position (in the case of deans, primarily the discipline) proved to be a powerful screening devise

that affected a dean's ability to move to a higher administrative position (Moore, 1982; Moore, Salimbene, Marlier, & Bragg, 1983).

The National Deans Study

Data reported in this paper were collected using a survey of academic deans in the United States (Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton & Hermanson, 1996). The following criteria were used to construct the sample. Potential sample institutions came from one of the following three groupings of Carnegie classifications—Research I & II and Doctoral I & II; Masters I & II; or Baccalaureate I & II. From this initial group of colleges and universities, 60 public and 60 private institutions were randomly selected from each Carnegie category resulting in a sample of 360 institutions. At each of the sample institutions, the deans of the colleges of education, business, liberal arts, and nursing were asked to complete the survey. (In previous survey research, where department chairs were randomly sampled, researchers found that less than 10% of the respondents were female. Assuming that this pattern might hold true for deans as well, we included colleges of nursing in a purposeful attempt to increase the number of female respondents.) The overall sample size consisted of 1,370 deans, with a response rate of 60%.[1] Forty-one percent of the respondents were women.

A General Profile of Female Academic Deans

Female academic deans were split evenly between public and private universities, and there was generally a good representation from each of the three institutional categories with

---

[1]Research instruments used in the survey include the Dean's Stress Inventory (Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton & Hermanson, 1996), Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Questionnaire (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970), Dean's Task Inventory (Gmelch et al., 1996), Satisfaction with Dean's Role (Gmelch et al., 1996), Dean's Leadership Inventory (Rosenbach and Sashkin, 1995) and demographic and contextual variables (Gmelch et al., 1996).

36% of the sample working at research, 43% at comprehensive, and 21% at baccalaureate universities. More than one-half of the female respondents were located in urban areas with an additional 26% at suburban locales. Of the female deans in the sample, 47% were deans in nursing colleges; 25% were from education; 23% were from liberal arts; 4% served as deans of colleges of business. Typically, the female deans in our sample were just over 53 years old. More than half of them were married. Fourteen percent of the female respondents carried minority status. Their average tenure in their current positions was five years. Their primary reason for having taken the deanship revolved around a desire to contribute to and improve the college (0 = 4.72).

Few had prior administrative experience as deans (less than 25%) or as associate deans (38%). A higher percentage had been department chairs (56%) before becoming dean. Women came to the deanship, with almost as much frequency, from other academic positions, such as coordinator or director (35%). Few had leadership or administrative experience outside of the academy prior to taking the deanship; and most did not move up a chain-of-command type career ladder (i.e., department chair, associate dean, dean) to get to the position. These women appeared to have no clearly agreed upon career goals beyond the deanship, but the choices most often selected included: a return to faculty (22%), seeking a higher academic leadership position, such as provost (23%), staying put (19%), or retiring (19%). (See Tables 1 and 4 for further information.)

A General Profile of Male Academic Deans

Fifty-nine percent of the respondents were male; 60% worked at public institutions. Of the male respondents, 32% of the sample were employed at research, 48% at comprehensive, and 20% at baccalaureate universities. Less than one-half of the male respondents (40%) were

located in urban areas. An additional 27% lived in suburban locales. Of the male deans in the sample, 7% were deans in nursing colleges; 32% were from education; 33% were from liberal arts; 27% served as deans of colleges of business. The male deans in our sample were, on average, just over 54 years old. Most of them were married. Ten percent of the male sample carried minority status. The average tenure of these deans in their current positions was almost six years. Male deans, for the most part, aspired to the position for the same reason as female deans—to improve the college (0 = 4.71).

About one-third of them had prior administrative experience as deans or as associate deans. A higher percentage had been department chairs (66%) before becoming dean. Slightly more men than women in the study had either worked in other academic leadership positions (38%), but fewer had held senior management positions outside the academy (17%). Similar to their female counterparts, male deans did not necessarily ascend up a formal career ladder to the deanship. A higher proportion of male deans had decided to return to faculty positions (26%) or seek a higher academic leadership position (28%) than had their female counterparts. Fewer planned to retire (15%). (See Tables 1 and 4.)

General Profile of Minority Status Deans

Roughly 12% of the sample carried minority status. Slightly more than one-half of these respondents were African-American (one-half were female). On average, they were 54 years old, were married, and had been in their present positions for just over five years. The majority (57%) of them worked at public institutions. Thirty-two percent were employed at research universities, 41% at comprehensive, and 27% at baccalaureate institutions. Most lived in urban or suburban areas (75%). The largest proportion (35%) headed colleges of education, followed by liberal arts (31%). Fewer deans of minority status in this study were found in nursing (20%)

or business (13%) colleges. Their primary reason for taking the job: to improve the college (0 = 4.84). (See Table 1.)

Thirty-eight percent of minority status deans had prior experience as dean before taking their current positions. The majority had been department chair (64%). Fewer had been associate dean (24%), but 36% had held other types of academic positions prior to their current one. Twenty-three percent of these respondents indicated that they had been in senior management positions outside higher education prior to coming to the deanship. Again, as with men and women in this position in general, minority status deans experienced no clear lock-step approach to the deanship. These deans planned to return to faculty positions (27%), seek higher positions (31%), or retire (21%). (See Tables 1 and 4.)

General Profile of Deans by Institution Type

Research universities in the study were predominately public institutions (74%), located in urban or suburban areas. The largest proportion of deans at these universities who responded to the survey were housed in colleges of education (31%) and nursing (29%), with smaller proportions heading liberal arts (24%) or business (17%) colleges. Forty-four percent of these colleges were headed by women; minority status deans accounted for 11% of this subset of the sample. The general demographic profile of these deans roughly parallels that of male deans, in general. Many of these deans had some type of prior administrative experience. One-half of them had been associate deans, more than 60% had been department chairs, and almost 30% had been both. Deans at research universities were somewhat more definitive about their next career moves than were respondents in general, with 28% wanting to return to the faculty and 27% desirous of higher academic leadership positions.

The general profile of deans at comprehensive universities bears some similarity to that

of research university deans, but some differences do exist. A smaller percentage of deans in this group were women (39%); fewer were married (76%), and slightly fewer carry minority status (10%). More of the institutions are private (42%); more are located in suburbia (32%), and their deans have held their positions for a few months longer (5.8 to 5.6 years) than deans at research universities. Fewer of these deans have been associate deans (36%). About the same percentage have been department chairs or held other leadership positions. A higher percentage of them (20%) have had outside administrative experience. Only 19% of these deans have been both associate deans and department chairs. Twenty-seven percent see their next move as one to a higher academic position.

Deans at baccalaureate universities are younger, on average, than their counterparts at research and comprehensive universities. Forty-two percent are female; 15% are people of color. They have been in their current positions for a shorter period of time (5.4 years). Only 1/3 work at public institutions with a larger percentage located in rural areas (41%) than was the case for the other two groups. More of these deans head liberal arts colleges (34%) than professional schools (education 24%, nursing 18%, business 15%). Similar to deans at the other types of institutions, more than one-half of these baccalaureate institution deans have been department chairs (63%), but fewer have been associate deans (15%). A larger percentage (37%) of them have held other types of academic leadership positions than have deans at research or comprehensive universities. Only 10% have been associate deans and chairs. Their career aspirations resemble those of other deans, with the exception that a higher percentage (19%) plan to retire. (See Tables 2 and 4.)

General Profile of Deans by Discipline

Deans from four disciplines—liberal arts, business, education, and nursing—were

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

surveyed. Responses from deans of liberal arts and education colleges seem somewhat similar. The portion of women in the deanship in both colleges hovers around one-third (education 35%, liberal arts 31%). About the same percentage in each college were married. Age-wise, they were less than one-half year apart, on average. These colleges employ more deans of color than the other two types of colleges surveyed. The highest percentage of deans responding in both disciplines were from colleges housed at comprehensive universities. And for the most part, their universities were located in urban areas; one-third of the education deans in the sample were, however, working in rural settings.

The extremes in the data, when examined by discipline, were found in the responses of the deans from the other two colleges—business and nursing. Business colleges in the study employed the lowest percentage of women (10%) and minority status deans (*%); nursing deanships were filled by the highest percentage of women (84%). The average tenure of business deans was 5 years. The average time in the position for nursing deans was over 6½ years.

When we examine career path patterns across these four disciplines, several interesting themes appear. First, almost 70% of the liberal arts deans have been department chairs, less than 55% of the business deans have held the same position. Second, 40% percent of the education deans and 36% of those in liberal arts colleges had some experience in other academic leadership positions. Fewer business and nursing deans had this type of experience. Third, only 8% of the liberal arts deans had held senior management positions outside the academy, and only 14% of education deans had such experience. Nursing and business deans, in contrast, were much more apt to have worked outside of the academy sometime prior to the deanship (nursing 27%, business 31%). Fourth, more liberal arts, nursing, and education deans had held both associate

dean and chair positions. Twenty to twenty-five percent of these deans had served in both capacities. Less than 15% of business deans had followed the same trajectory. Finally, business and nursing deans were slightly more likely than the others to have been both senior managers outside higher education institutions and department chairs within their respective college types.

In terms of their career moves after the deanship, fewer deans of nursing planned to return to faculty positions. Almost no one wanted to move to the same position at a similar institution, and liberal arts deans absolutely did not want to move outside the academy. (Education deans were slightly more likely to make a lateral move, and business deans were more apt to view non-academic leadership as an option). A higher proportion of deans in liberal arts colleges (over 1/3 compared to about 1/4 in the other colleges) saw the provost or a comparable position as their next option. Finally, a higher percentage of deans in nursing colleges plan on retiring out of the deanship. Fewer of the dean in the other three discipline areas saw this as a viable alternative. (See Tables 3 and 4.)

Significant Differences Between Male and Female Deans

Female respondents were significantly younger, although the difference was just one year (p-value = .03), and less apt to be married (p-value = .00). Sixty-eight percent of women in contrast to 91% of men were married. Women were also somewhat more likely to carry minority status (p-value = .03). Women were significantly more likely to be located on urban campuses and much less apt to work at rural universities. They were less likely to be working at public universities. They were more likely to be deans of nursing; men, in contrast, headed the other three types of colleges at a significantly higher rate. Women were significantly less likely to have had experience as dean (p-value = .02), department chair (p-value = .00), or in senior management in organizations outside higher education (p-value = .08) prior to taking their

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

current position. Women were slightly less apt to move to another deanship at a similar institution and were more likely to express little interest in moving than men; and the differences were significant. (See Table 5.)

Significant Differences Between Minority and Non-minority Deans

Few significant differences separate minority from non-minority deans. Those, which do exist, appear in location, reason for taking the position, and prior experience. Minority deans were more likely to be working in urban locations, had taken the deanship for the same reason as everyone else but felt more strongly about it, and had been associate deans less often. (See Table 6.)

Significant Differences in Deans by Institutional Type

There also seem to be relatively few significant differences in deans by institution type. What differences do exist do so primarily in marital status, location, and experience. Deans at research universities were significantly more likely to be married (p-value = .04) and to have held an associate dean position (p-value = .00). They were less likely to have been in the ranks of senior management in organizations outside higher education. They were more apt to be working at public institutions (p-value = .00) in urban locations (p-value = .00) in colleges of nursing (p-value = .05).

Deans at comprehensive universities were less likely to be married (p-value = .00), less apt to be in urban communities (p-value = .04), but were more likely to work in suburbia (p-value = .00). Deans at baccalaureate universities were significantly younger (p-value = .00), more apt to be married (p-value = .08), and to have been mentored by someone within the institution where they worked ((p-value = .03). They were less likely to work in public universities and were significantly less likely to live and work in urban locations. They were

more apt to be located in rural America in liberal arts colleges. These deans were less likely to have been deans (p-value = .01) or associate deans (p-value = .00) prior to their current positions. (See Table 7.)

Significant Differences in Deans by Discipline

Across disciplines, several interesting significant differences existed. Liberal arts deans were more likely to have been mentored by males (p-value = .07) from within their institutions (p-value = .00). They were more likely to work at baccalaureate universities and less likely to be located at research universities. They were more apt to have been department chairs (p-value = .00) but less likely to have worked outside the academy (p-value = .00). Liberal arts deans were significantly more likely to choose seeking to a provost-type leadership position (p-value = .00) as an anticipated career move than were their counterparts at other colleges. And, they were less likely to either want to move outside the academy or retire.

Business deans were significantly more likely to be married (p-value = .00) and more apt to have male mentors ((p-value = .00). They spent less time in their current positions (p-value = .08) and were more apt to have worked outside higher education (p-value = .00). They were also more likely to view a move to a non-academic leadership position as a viable option (p-value = .02).

Education deans are at public institutions ((p-value = .00). They had been deans at other universities (p-value = .03) and directors or coordinators (p-value = .03), but had significantly less experience in management outside the academy (p-value = .03), prior to their current deanship. Education deans were more likely to take a deanship at a similar institution (p-value = .02) but less likely to move to a higher position within the academy (p-value = .08).

Deans of nursing colleges were significantly less likely to be married (p-value = .00).

They were more likely to be working in urban settings (p-value = .03) rather than rural (p-value = .03) at research universities (p-value = .00). These deans had been in their current positions significantly longer than their counterparts in education, business, and liberal arts (p-value = .00). Nursing deans were less likely to return to faculty or seek higher academic leadership positions but were more likely to retire than were deans in other disciplines. (See Table 8).

Discussion of Present-Day Dean Career Paths

Findings from this research project substantiate many of those from former studies, while at the same time providing additional insights. First, after, almost twenty years, women and minorities remain underrepresented in the deanship. To be certain, the female representation in this particular study is high. But, participation was purposefully skewed to ensure that this was the case. Almost one-half of the female respondents were deans of colleges of nursing. If they had not been included in the study, the percentage of female respondents would have been about 25%. If the research design had required that the sample be completely random and include more professional colleges, such as medicine, engineering, and law, which have traditionally been headed by men, this percentage would, in all likelihood, have been lower. We base this supposition on evidence from the current study. Only 4% of the female respondents headed business colleges, another traditional male bastion. And, although the minority representation in the sample was roughly 12%, we suspect that a completely random selection process would have resulted in a lower percentage of the respondents being minority deans as well.

Interestingly, another trend has not substantially changed either. Female deans are still significantly less likely to be married when compared to male deans. This finding may indicate that almost 20 years after the first studies, the job and societal norms, in general, remain such

that women in leadership positions find themselves unable to pursue both a marriage and a career. One might ask: Is this because they have no "wife" at home to keep their personal lives in order?

Second, deans still do not follow a set career trajectory. The route to the deanship remains haphazard but shows some signs of change. In Moore's study fewer than 30% of deans had been department chairs prior to becoming dean. Today, more than 60% of all deans had been chairs. And, while women were significantly less likely than their male counterparts to have been chairs, a great many of them had filled this position prior to taking the deanship. Minority-status deans had also been chairs. Such a finding seems to indicate that the department chair's position may be a jumping off point for the deanship, especially at research universities. In addition, a fair number of deans had experience as directors or coordinators, which suggests that this position is at least as viable a training ground as the associate dean or chair positions appear to be. A growing number of deans seem to be getting experience in management outside the academy before coming to the deanship as well. These trends may all signify a recognition on the part of universities and deans alike that some form of training is crucial.

Finally, no one group of deans sees their particular position as the natural stepping off point for the provost position, although liberal arts and sciences deans were more apt to suggest that seeking a higher academic administrative position was their next career move than were deans in other disciplines. Twenty-five percent or more of all deans plan to return to their faculties. A more disturbing finding lies in the fact that while deans of nursing average more time in their positions (the logical projection of which is to say they have more experience) than do other deans, they are the least likely group to aspire to higher administrative positions. And, in fact they are more apt than other deans to see retirement as their next move. Assuming that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

nursing deans understand the system and have performed well enough in it to survive longer than other deans, the loss of such talent may prove to be a higher education leadership drain.

Conclusion

This study only begins to scratch the surface in terms of examining career paths in the academy. Findings do suggest that the department chairship may constitute the best starting point for aspirants to the deanship, but whether such experience provides adequate preparation remains a question. In fact, experience, no matter how much deans gain from former administrative positions, does not appear to be enough. Tenure in the position is relatively short; many deans express the urge to move out of leadership positions—back into the faculty or out into retirement. Such movement suggests an emerging gap in experienced leadership in the deanship. A more systematic approach to preparing deans seems to be in order. Ongoing seminars and workshops that allow deans to hone their leadership skills will help. But, perhaps more importantly a series of apprenticeships and shadowing exercises within an experienced dean's office might benefit those about to make a career move to the deanship. At institutions, like research universities, where a more definitive career path seems to be emerging, early identification of faculty with leadership potential and then a subsequent sequencing of leadership experiences for those interested in pursuing the deanship could also strengthen this crucial leadership link and improve the lines of succession to it..

While the deanship serves as a critical connection between faculty and central administration, the chief academic officer or provost on a campus may prove to be the most important in terms of instituting academic change. Little is know about the progression to this position, and results from the deans study offer no clear indication that the logical successors, in

terms of experience, to this position plan to pursue it.

In addition, too little is known about women and minority-status deans. While inroads into this arena have been made, we simply do not have a good understanding of how to get women and minorities into the deanship, especially in disciplines which have historically been dominated by white males, and once there what makes them successful.

The academic deanship has become an increasingly visible position in the academy. The more we understand about what the position entails, who the people who fill the position are, what types of training and administrative experience they possess, and where they plan to go once they have completed their deanships, the more likely we will be to select and develop effective academic leadership.

REFERENCES

Astin, H.S., Antonio, A.L., Cress, C.M., & Astin, A.W. (1997). *Race and ethnicity in the American professorate, 1995-96*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.

Blackburn, R.T., Chapman, D.W., & Cameron, S.M. (1981). "Cloning" in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. *Research in Higher Education, 15*(4), 315-327.

Forbes, J.B. & Piercy, J.E. (1991). *Corporate mobility and paths to the top: Studies for human resource and management development specialists*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L. & Hermanson, M. (1996). *The 1996 National Survey of Academic Deans in Higher Education*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University, The Center for Academic Leadership.

Graves, S. B. (1990). A case of double jeopardy? Black women in higher education. *Initiatives, 53*(1), 3-8.

Konrad, A.M. & Pfeffer, J. (1991). Understanding the hiring of women and minorities in educational institutions. *Sociology of Education, 64*(3), 141-157.

Malos, S.B. & Campion, M.A. (1995). An options based model of career mobility in professional service firms. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 611-644.

Mech, T. (1997). The managerial roles of chief academic officers. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(3), 282-298.

Moore, K. M. (1982). *Women and minorities: Leaders in transition*. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Moore, K.M., & Sagaria, M.D. (1981). Women administrators and mobility: The second struggle. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 44*(2), 21-28.

Moore, K. M., Salimbene, A. M., Marlier, J. D. & Bragg, S. M. (1983). The structure of presidents' and deans' career. *Journal of Higher Education 54*(5), 500-515.

Ost, D.H., & Twist, D.J. (1989). Appointment of administrators in higher education: Reflections of administrative structures and organizational structures. *Initiatives, 52*(2). 23-30.

Park, S.M. (1996). Research, teaching, and service: Why shouldn't women's work count? *Journal of Higher Education, 67*(1), 46-84.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J. & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150-163.

Rosenbach, W. E. & Sashkin, M. (1995). *Leadership Inventory*. Gettysburg, PA: Gettysburg College, Eisenhower Leadership Program.

Ross, M. , & Green, M.F. (1990). The rules of the game: The unwritten code of career mobility. *New Directions for Higher Education, 72*(Winter), 67-77.

Sagaria, M.D., & Johnsrud, L.K. (1987). *Administrative Intrainstitutional Mobility: The Structuring of opportunity*. Paper present at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Diego, CA.

Siow, A. (1994). Hierarchical career. *Industrial Relations, 33*, 83-105.

Thompson, D.E. & DiTomaso, N. (1988). *Ensuring minority success in corporate management.* New York, NY: Plenum Press,

Tinsley, A. (1985). Upward mobility for women administrators. *Journal of NAWDAC, 49*(1), 3-11.

Twombly, S. B. (1986). *Theoretical approaches to the study of career mobility*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Turner, C. S.V., Myers, S.L., & Cresswell, J.W. (1997). *Bittersweet success: Faculty of color in academe.* (Unpublished Manuscript).

Warner, R. (1988). *Career paths in higher education administration.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED294596).

Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Gmelch, W.H. (1998). *Women in academic deanship.* (Unpublished Manuscript).

Williams, S.S. (1985). Surviving double jeopardy in Academe: Minority female administrators at predominately white institutions. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Milwaukee, WI.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Female, Male, and Minority Status* Deans

Variable	Number			Mean			Standard Deviation		
	F	M	MS	F	M	MS	F	M	MS
Personal									
Female**			84			.52			.50
Married	319	459	85	.68	.91	.77	.47	.29	.42
Age	310	460	87	53.35	54.33	54.14	6.68	5.84	8.06
Minority Status***	323	463		.14	.10		.34	.29	
Years as Dean	320	466	87	5.31	5.83	5.19	4.37	4.55	4.93
Years Dean Prior to This Position	319	467	87	1.35	2.03	1.63	3.28	4.13	2.73
Years Associate Dean	319	466	87	1.61	1.82	1.16	2.77	3.35	2.58
Years Department Chair	319	466	87	2.66	4.19	3.53	3.79	4.69	5.06
Years Other Academic Admin.	319	466	87	2.30	2.27	2.37	4.34	4.66	4.64
Years Manager Outside Acad.	319	466	87	1.20	1.77	1.91	3.07	4.78	4.55
Took Job to Improve College**	309	458	81	4.72	4.71	4.84	.59	.57	.40
Next Professional Move									
Return to Faculty	308	454	85	.22	.26	.27	.42	.44	.45
Deanship at Similar University	308	454	85	.03	.06	.01	.17	.23	.11
Deanship at More Prestigious U	308	454	85	.10	.09	.05	.30	.28	.21
Higher Academic Leadership	308	454	85	.23	.28	.31	.42	.45	.46
Non-academic Leadership	308	454	85	.04	.03	.05	.20	.17	.21
Not Interested in Moving	308	454	85	.19	.14	.11	.39	.35	.31
Retirement	308	454	84	.19	.15	.21	.39	.36	.41
Institutional									
Public Institution	311	459	87	.53	.60	.57	.50	.49	.50
Research/Doctoral	310	453	85	.36	.32	.32	.48	.47	.47
Comprehensive	310	454	85	.43	.48	.41	.50	.50	.50
Baccalaureate	310	454	85	.21	.20	.27	.41	.40	.45
College . . .									
Education	312	457	85	.25	.32	.35	.43	.47	.48
Liberal Arts	311	457	85	.23	.33	.31	.41	.47	.46
Health Related	312	457	85	.47	.07	.20	.50	.25	.40
Business	311	456	84	.04	.27	.13	.20	.45	.34
Location									
Urban	308	455	86	.51	.40	.55	.50	1.71	.50
Suburban	308	455	86	.26	.27	.20	.44	.49	.40
Rural	308	455	86	.22	.32	.26	.42	.45	.44

*Slightly more than ½ of this group were African American
**Relevant to minority status deans only
***Relevant to non-minority male and female deans only
**** Rated on a 1-5 scale with 1 low, 5 high

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Deans by Institutional Type*

Variable	Number			Mean			Standard Deviation		
	R	C	B	R	C	B	R	C	B
Personal									
Female	255	346	154	.44	39	.42	.50	.49	.50
Married	250	350	155	.86	.76	.86	.35	.43	.34
Age	250	342	154	54.20	54.25	52.60	5.32	6.34	6.82
Minority Status	255	350	156	.11	.10	.15	.31	.30	.36
Years as Dean	255	351	155	5.64	5.83	5.40	4.43	4.73	4.08
Years Dean Prior to This Position	254	351	156	1.86	2.03	1.09	3.83	4.16	3.11
Years Associate Dean	254	351	156	2.45	1.62	.81	3.31	2.95	2.77
Years Department Chair	254	351	156	3.21	3.80	3.45	3.73	4.65	4.15
Years Other Academic Admin.	254	351	156	1.98	2.18	3.20	3.89	4.40	5.67
Years Manager Outside Acad.	254	351	156	1.12	1.77	1.69	3.89	4.36	4.46
Took Job to Improve College**	248	351	156	4.71	4.72	4.72	.61	.58	.54
Next Professional Move									
Return to Faculty	245	347	157	.28	.23	.27	.45	.42	.44
Deanship at similar University	245	347	157	.04	.03	.05	.19	.22	.22
Deanship at more prestigious U	245	347	157	.08	.10	.09	.27	.31	.29
Higher Academic Leadership	245	347	157	.27	.27	.22	.44	.44	.42
Non-academic Leadership	245	347	157	.04	.03	.03	.20	.18	.18
Not Interested in Moving	245	347	157	.17	.16	.15	.37	.37	.36
Retirement	245	347	157	.14	.16	.19	.35	.37	.39
Institutional									
Public Institution	249	351	157	.74	.58	.33	.44	.49	.47
College . . .									
Education	254	348	154	.31	.30	.24	.46	.46	.43
Liberal Arts	254	348	154	.24	.30	.34	.43	.49	.48
Health Related	254	348	154	.29	.21	.18	.45	.41	.39
Business	254	348	154	.17	.19	.15	.37	.39	.36
Location									
Urban	247	347	156	.57	.40	.32	.50	.47	.47
Suburban	247	347	156	.20	.32	.27	.40	.49	.44
Rural	247	347	156	.23	.28	.41	.42	.45	.49

*R (Research), C (Comprehensive), B (Baccalaureate)
** Rated on a 1-5 scale with 1 low, 5 high

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Deans by Discipline*

Variable	Number				Mean				Standard Deviation			
	A	B	E	N	A	B	E	N	A	B	E	N
Personal												
Female	217	135	218	176	.31	.10	.35	.84	.46	.30	.48	.37
Married	219	135	215	175	.80	.93	.82	.73	.40	.26	.38	.44
Age	214	135	215	172	53.92	53.56	54.39	54.34	6.20	6.26	5.69	6.53
Minority Status	219	136	220	177	.12	.08	.14	.10	.32	.27	.34	.30
Years as Dean	219	136	221	176	5.35	5.02	5.60	6.58	4.20	4.15	4.58	4.96
Years Dean Prior to This Position	219	137	220	175	1.67	1.66	2.24	1.49	3.67	3.51	4.42	3.54
Years Associate Dean	219	137	220	175	1.55	1.88	1.76	2.01	3.16	3.07	3.33	2.94
Years Department Chair	219	137	220	175	4.26	3.20	3.45	3.08	4.43	4.73	4.35	3.96
Years Other Academic Admin.	219	137	220	175	2.01	2.16	2.91	1.97	4.14	4.82	5.07	3.94
Years Manager Outside Acad.	219	137	220	175	.50	3.63	1.00	1.76	2.10	6.83	3.28	3.66
Took Job to Improve College**	218	135	214	171	4.76	4.73	4.74	4.64	.57	.55	.53	.65
Next Professional Move												
Return to Faculty	216	135	217	171	.27	.24	.27	.18	.45	.43	.44	.38
Deanship at similar University	216	135	217	171	.04	.02	.07	.03	.19	.15	.26	.17
Deanship at more prestigious U	216	135	217	171	.08	.12	.08	.11	.28	.32	.28	.31
Higher Academic Leadership	216	135	217	171	.35	.26	.22	.21	.48	.44	.41	.41
Non-academic Leadership	216	135	217	171	.00	.07	.02	.05	.07	.25	.15	.22
Not Interested in Moving	216	135	217	171	.15	.14	.17	.19	.36	.35	.38	.39
Retirement	216	135	217	171	.12	.16	.17	.23	.33	.36	.38	.42
Institutional												
Public Institution	218	131	221	172	.57	.54	.63	.59	.50	.50	.48	.49
Research/Doctoral	217	131	220	174	.28	.32	.36	.43	.45	.47	.48	.50
Comprehensive	217	131	220	174	.48	.50	.48	.41	.50	.50	.50	.49
Baccalaureate	217	131	220	174	.24	.18	.17	.16	.43	.38	.37	.37
Location												
Urban	219	136	215	170	.44	.44	.40	.52	.50	.50	.49	.50
Suburban	219	136	215	170	.27	.26	.27	.26	.45	.44	.45	.44
Rural	219	136	215	170	.29	.29	.33	.22	.45	.46	.47	.42

*A (Liberal Arts/Sciences), B (Business), E (Education), N (Nursing)
** Rated on a 1-5 scale with 1 low, 5 high

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4: Most Common Career Paths for Deans by Percentage

Position	% to Hold Position									
	Gender		*Minority*	*Institution Type*			*Discipline*			
	M	F	Status	Res.	Comp.	Bac.	Lib.Arts	Business	Education	Nursing
Dean, Previous to Current Position	.32	.22	.38	.31	.32	.20	.30	.32	.33	.28
Associate Dean	.35	.38	.24	.50	.36	.15	.33	.39	.35	.45
Department Chair	.66	.56	.64	.62	.63	.63	.69	.54	.64	.58
Other Academic Position	.38	.35	.36	.32	.33	.37	.36	.29	.40	.28
Senior Management Outside H. E	.17	.20	.23	.15	.20	.17	.08	.31	.14	.27
Previous Dean & Chair	.22	.16	.26	.19	.21	.15	.21	.18	.23	.15
Associate Dean & Chair	.20	.21	.15	.28	.19	.10	.20	.14	.23	.25
Department Chair & Other	.19	.16	.22	.15	.18	.17	.20	.12	.21	.13
Department Chair & Sr. Management	.09	.11	.13	.06	.11	.11	.05	.13	.08	.14

Note: Few deans held both a previous and associate deanships, a previous deanship or associate deanship and another academic leadership position, or a previous deanship and a senior management position prior to taking their current positions.

Table 5: Tests for Differences Between Male and Female Deans in Means of Descriptive Variables*

Descriptive Variable Set	Mean	*t*-statistic	*p*-value
Age			
Female	53.35	2.12	*.034
Male	54.34		
Married			
Female	0.680	8.64	*.000
Male	0.914		
Minority			
Female	0.136	2.13	*.033
Male	0.088		
Location			
Urban			
Female	0.507	2.78	*.006
Males	0.405		
Rural			
Female	0.238	2.82	*.005
Male	0.328		
Public Institution			
Female	0.534	2.04	*.042
Male	0.608		
Liberal Arts College			
Female	0.219	3.46	*.001
Male	0.333		
Business College			
Female	0.042	8.57	*.000
Male	0.273		
Education College			
Female	0.247	2.06	*.040
Male	0.315		
College of Nursing			
Female	0.474	15.05	*.000
Male	0.063		
Career Path Experience			
Had Been Dean Previously			
Female	1.347	2.40	*.017
Males	2.010		
Had Been Department Chairs			
Female	2.660	4.87	*.000
Males	4.208		
Had Senior Management Experience Outside HE.			
Female	1.235	1.74	*.082
Male	1.768		
Next Move			
A Move to Another Dean's Position at a Similar Institution			
Female	0.029	1.87	*.061
Male	0.058		
No Interest in Moving			
Female	0.192	1.93	*.054
Male	0.140		

*Only variables where significant differences appear are reported.

Table 6: Tests for Differences Between Minority and Non-minority Deans in Means of Descriptive Variables*

Descriptive Variable Set	Mean	*t*-statistic	**p*-value
Location			
Urban			
Minority	0.547	2.03	*.046
Non-minority	0.431		
Took the Position to Contribute to and Improve the College			
Minority	4.835	2.06	*.040
Non-minority	4.698		
Experience as an Associate Dean			
Minority	1.156	1.86	*.063
Non-minority	1.818		

*Only variables where significant differences appear are reported.

Table 7: Tests for Differences Between Deans in Means of Descriptive Variables by Institution Type*

Descriptive Variable Set	Mean	*t*-statistic	**p*-value
Research Universities			
Married			
Research	0.856	2.04	*.042
Other	0.795		
Experience as Associate Dean			
Research	2.455	4.58	*.000
Other	1.378		
Experience in Senior Management Outside the University			
Research	1.122	1.76	*.079
Other	1.677		
Location			
Public			
Research	0.743	6.53	*.000
Other	0.500		
Urban			
Research	0.571	5.09	*.000
Other	0.377		
Suburban			
Research	0.198	3.06	*.002
Other	0.304		
Rural			
Research	0.231	2.52	*.012
Other	0.319		
Liberal Arts College			
Research	0.236	2.23	*.026
Other	0.314		
College of Nursing			
Research	0.290	2.79	*.005
Other	0.200		
Comprehensive			
Married			
Comprehensive	0.763	3.49	*.001
Other	0.861		
Urban Location			
Comprehensive	0.401	2.05	*.040
Other	0.475		
Suburban Location			
Comprehensive	0.320	2.89	*.004
Other	0.226		
Baccalaureate			
Age			
Baccalaureate	52.60	2.95	*.003
Other	54.24		
Married			
Baccalaureate	0.864	1.73	*.083
Other	0.803		

Location

Public			
Baccalaureate	0.331	7.42	*.000
Other	0.646		
Urban			
Baccalaureate	0.321	3.42	*.001
Other	0.472		
Rural			
Baccalaureate	0.410	3.76	8.000
Other	0.258		
Liberal Arts College			
Baccalaureate	0.344	1.75	*.081
Other	0.273		
Experience			
Deanship Previous to Current Position			
Baccalaureate	1.093	2.51	*.012
Other	1.960		
Association Dean			
Baccalaureate	0.808	4.25	*.000
Other	1.976		

*Only variables where significant differences appear are reported.

Table 9: Tests for Differences Between Deans in Means of Descriptive Variables by Discipline*

Descriptive Variable Set	Mean	*t*-statistic	**p*-value
Liberal Arts			
Location			
Research University			
Liberal Arts	0.277	2.23	*.026
Other	0.361		
Baccalaureate University			
Liberal Arts	0.244	1.75	*.081
Other	0.188		
Career Path			
Experience			
Had Been Department Chair			
Liberal Arts	4.259	2.83	*.005
Other	3.266		
Had Senior Management Experience Outside HE.			
Liberal Arts	0.500	4.30	*.000
Other	1.906		
Next Move			
Move to a Higher Position in Academic Leadership			
Liberal Arts	0.352	3.64	*.000
Other	0.224		
Change to a Non-academic Leadership Position			
Liberal Arts	0.005	2.87	*.004
Other	0.047		
Retirement			
Liberal Arts	0.120	2.09	*.037
Other	0.183		
Business			
Married			
Business	0.926	3.74	*.000
Other	0.789		
Career Path			
Experience			
Years as Dean			
Business	5.016	1.73	*.084
Other	5.747		
Had Senior Management Experience Outside HE.			
Business	3.628	6.88	*.000
Other	1.029		
Next Move			
Change to a Non-academic Leadership Position			
Business	0.067	2.27	*.024
Other	0.028		
Education			
Location			
Public			
Education	0.629	1.72	*.085
Other	0.361		
Career Path			

Experience			
Had Been Dean Previous to Current Position			
Education	2.248	2.21	*.027
Other	1.563		
Had Senior Management Experience Outside HE.			
Education	1.002	2.14	*.033
Other	1.906		
Had Experience in Other HE Leader—Director, Coordinator			
Education	2.914	2.22	*.026
Other	2.104		
Next Move			
Move to a Deanship at a Similar Institution			
Education	0.074	2.41	*.016
Other	0.034		
Move to a Higher Position in Academic Leadership			
Education	0.217	1.74	*.082
Other	0.278		
Nursing			
Married			
Nursing	0.731	3.21	*.001
Other	0.839		
Location			
Urban			
Nursing	0.518	2.21	*.028
Other	0.421		
Rural			
Nursing	0.223	2.11	*.035
Other	0.307		
Research University			
Nursing	0.425	2.79	*.005
Other	0.311		
Career Path			
Experience			
Years in Current Dean Position			
Nursing	6.580	3.24	*.001
Other	3.266		
Next Move			
Return to Faculty			
Nursing	0.175	2.43	*.015
Other	0.266		
Move to a Higher Position in Academic Leadership			
Nursing	0.210	1.69	*.092
Other	0.275		
Retirement			
Nursing	0.234	2.72	*.007
Other	0.146		

*Only variables where significant differences appear are reported.